UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,547	10/23/2003	Randy Knight Winjum	13768.468	3629

47973   7590   08/02/2007

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/693,547	WINJUM ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 October 2003*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10/23/03* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/22/06, 5/09/05, 05/03/05*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the communications filed 10/23/03. Claims 1-21

have been presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 2/22/06, 5/9/05, and

5/3/05 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the

information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.'   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed

towards a data structure per se or a "connection". The specification, on paragraphs

0023-0024, states that the computer readable medium could comprise a data structure

and/or connection. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being taught by Ogilvie et al

(USPAT 6,324,569) hereinafter Ogilvie.

As to claim 1, Ogilvie teaches in a computer system that is network connectable

along with one or more other computer systems to a network, a method for determining

if an attachment is to be deleted in response to a deletion command requesting deletion

of a corresponding electronic message, the method comprising: an act of receiving a

body portion of an electronic message (abstract);

an act of receiving an attachment associated with the electronic message; an act

of receiving a delete command requesting deletion of the electronic message (abstract;

col 6, lines 1-67);

an act of deleting the electronic message in accordance with the received delete

command; and an act of referring to a data field of the attachment to determine if the

attachment is to be deleted (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 2, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of

receiving a body portion of an electronic message comprises an act of receiving a body

portion of an electronic message wherein the body portion is included in an electronic

message selected from among an electronic mail message, an instant message, a fax

message, a news group posting, a voice message, and a blog entry (col 2, lines 33-65).

As to claim 3, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of

receiving a body portion of an electronic message comprises an act of receiving a body

portion of an electronic message, the electronic message being defined in accordance

with one or more extension schemas (col 2, lines 33-65.

As to claim 4, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of

receiving an attachment associated with the electronic message comprises an act of

receiving an attachment that was included in the electronic message (col 7, lines 4-11

and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 5, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of

receiving an attachment associated with the electronic message comprises an act of

receiving an attachment that includes an attachment metadata field, the attachment

metadata field storing message related data associated with the electronic message

such that if the electronic message is deleted message related data associated the

electronic message can nonetheless be returned in response to a query (col 7, lines 4-

11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 6, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of

receiving an attachment associated with the electronic message comprises an act of

receiving an attachment that includes an IsPinned field, the value stored in the IsPinned

field indicating if the attachment is coupled to the electronic message (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 7, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: an act of storing the electronic message and the body portion in a message silo of a database, the electronic message and body portion being stored along with one or more other message items defined in accordance with a message schema; an act of storing the attachment in a silo of the database; and an act of maintaining a link between the attachment and the electronic message (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 8, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of receiving a delete command requesting deletion of the electronic message comprises an act of receiving a delete command that originated at a user message application (col 8, lines 42-60).

As to claim 9, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of deleting the electronic message in accordance with the received delete command comprises an act of deleting the electronic message and the body portion from a message silo of a database (col 6, lines 1-67.

As to claim 10, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein that act of referring to a data field of the attachment to determine if the attachment is to be deleted comprises an act of referring to the value of an IsPinned field to determine if the

attachment is coupled to the electronic message (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 11, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of referring to an act of referring to a data field of the attachment to determine if the attachment is to be deleted comprises an act of determining that the attachment is not to be deleted (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 12, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of referring to an act of referring to a data field of the attachment to determine if the attachment is to be deleted comprises an act of determining that the attachment is to be deleted (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

As to claim 13, Ogilvie teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: an act of deleting the attachment from a silo of a database (col 7, lines 4-11 and col 11, lines 44-53).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AMN

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER